UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

San Francisco Tells the World

By Robert Whitaker

Our Hopes of Peace - *John Haynes Holmes*

Churches, Disarm! - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

Woman's Part in Peace - - *By a Woman*

Einstein's Pacifism and the Jew
- - - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

For a Better Social Order—Equitism
- - - - - - *Vaughn Bachman Brokaw*

VOLUME CXIII NUMBER 13

Chicago, August 20, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 243
Our Hopes of Peace—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 245

ARTICLES—

Churches, Disarm! JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 247
Woman's Part in Peace—BY A WOMAN 249
Einstein's Pacifism and the Jews—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 251
San Francisco Tells the World—ROBERT WHITAKER 255
Proposed Roads to a Better Social Order—No. 10, Equitism—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 256

POETRY—

Efficiency!—*MacFlecknoe* 243
Si Vis Pacem Para Bellum—E. GUY TALBOTT 246
Tissaphernes—A. E. BRUCE 254
1914-1934—MARGARET LATHROP LAW 254

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Socialist Rejoinder—DEVERE ALLEN 258

THE FIELD—

The Briand-Kellogg Pact—LUCIA AMES MEAD 242
"Don't Tell!"—*Laurence Houseman* 260

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Briand-Kellogg Pact

To the Editor of The *Courant:*

One may take a holiday from business, and it is often a duty, but when the world is in ferment, one can not drop patriotic obligations. On August 22 will occur a notable anniversary. On that day, in 1928, the Briand-Kellogg Pact was signed in Paris. This pledged the sixty nations - wide promise that, no matter what the nature of a dispute or what the cause of a dispute, to seek only pacific means of settlement. This was one of the most solemn compacts ever signed. It seemed to presage a new era. Since then the folly and faithlessness of a few signers have made many skeptical as to this pact.

It is now proposed at this critical time, when war and peace seem in the balance, that this anniversary should be widely celebrated and its solemn pledges be renewed in the heart of every loyal citizen in all the countries pledged to keep the peace. The safety of humanity depends on present action, in which America has enormous responsibility. Let all churches and patriotic organizations, all business men who dread anarchy and disaster, follow the recommendation of the Fellowship of Faiths that August 27 be made World Peace Day and that meetings be held in every region. The national Chairman is Bishop McConnell, the honorary president is Herbert Hoover, and the vice-presidents include Newton D. Baker, President Glenn Frank and Governor Gifford Pinchot.

This matter is but one of the many obligations resting on all Americans this summer, as we carefully nominate and elect the thirty-two Senators and 435 Representatives who are to become the voice of the people after the election in November. They must be chosen with religious care and with insistance that the Senate, when Congress opens, shall have the belated two-thirds vote for our entrance into the World Court. To be sure, we shall be able to withdraw from it and shall not now pledge our-

(*Continued on page 259*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIII MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 1934 Number 13

EFFICIENCY!
(From The *New Statesman* and *Nation,* London)

Democracy has proved, we're told,
A stale device and ineffective;
Too cumbersome to be controlled,
In these brisk times, by those who hold
Efficiency their sole objective.

How pat, across this shrill debate
Falls Hitler's latest illustration
Of how, in truth, men ought to rate
That brave, authoritarian State
Proposed to us for imitation;

Whose sturdier statecraft—based on might—
Needs no gray matter to revolve it,
Or ponder what is wise or right,
But, as each problem comes in sight,
Turns out a firing squad to sólve it!

—*MacFlecknoe.*

Events in Europe these past few weeks have come too fast to recount, and are too terrible to estimate. The June 30th massacre of the Storm Troop leaders in Germany had hardly settled into the horrified consciousness of mankind, when the Austrian uprising, with the assassination of Chancellor Dollfuss, shocked the world like an earthquake. Then, as though the cup of fear and foreboding were not already full and running over, there came the passing of President Von Hindenburg and the lightning-like assumption of supreme power in the Reich by Hitler. The meaning of these events seems to us obvious, and paradoxical. On the one hand, Hitler is growing weaker—the disintegration of the Nazi regime, in the face of inward dissension and outward discontent, has definitely begun. This is the explanation of the "purge," and the scattering of the Storm Troops. The German despot is seeking a new and firmer basis for his shaken rule, and turns naturally to the right—to the army officers, the great industrialists, and the monarchists. On the other hand, Hitler is growing more desperate and ruthless. Like Macbeth, he is being driven on by the furies of his own despair. The Austrian "putsch," of course inspired and engineered from Berlin, was a mad gesture of one who struck too soon, lest, later on, he be not able to strike at all. The instant seizure of all-power before Hindenburg's body had become cold, was the act of a man who could not afford to leave anything to chance or time. This is not so paradoxical, perhaps, as it appears, for it is the man who is slipping, is it not, who becomes suddenly desperate? The terror of the situation lies in just this fact—that a crazed demagogue will do anything to maintain his ascendency, and, if he fall, carry a world in ruins with him! Will civil war and complete chaos in Germany anticipate a European war, or will a European war be precipitated by the Nazi dictator to anticipate and forestall civil war? This seems to us the one question now before us.

It is interesting to read that American financiers are, or have been, in Berlin, to devise ways of extending credit to German industries. Among the financiers thus engaged are James H. Perkins, of the National City Bank of New York, and Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Company. The purpose of these gentlemen, of course, is to save the vast sums of American money—almost three billion marks in all—invested as loans in the Reich. The menace of the complete collapse of Germany's financial and industrial structure involves the possibility of the loss to American creditors of all this wealth. Hence the desire of American magnates to find some way of making new loans, adequately guaranteed, to protect the old! But there is another side to this whole business—or so it seems to us. For the bankruptcy of the Reich would mean the overthrow of Hitler and the Nazis. The whole great boycott of Germany is aimed straight and sure to this end. The avoidance of bankruptcy, on the other hand, would save the Swastika rule. The success of Perkins, Lamont, et al., in other words, means the reestablishment of Hitler for an indefinite time to come. Which, being translated, means again that the interest of American creditors is bound up with the triumph of the Nazis over their enemies and victims! This is a nice spectacle. While American citizens denounce Hitler, despise him, and would gladly destroy him, American money seeks eagerly his rescue and rehabilitation. One more proof, added to all the rest, that money has no morals, interest or ideals, principal or principle! We imagine, fortunately, that there is little chance of the American financiers being able to accomplish anything. Hitler's Germany is too far gone for good money to be safely thrown after bad. But the irony of the situation still remains—like the irony of a prosperous rise of wheat prices on the exchange at the news of continued and more dreadful drought. What a farce this capitalism is!

Dr. Tugwell is an able man—the ablest in Washington, as we have stated in these columns. But he shows

sad signs of stress and strain when he denounces as "infantile, obscene, and wicked" the criticisms of the AAA, now rolling and crashing like thunder across the vast stretches of the continent. Dr. Tugwell traces these criticisms to the calamitous drought. Not at all, sir! They began in these columns, for example, over a year ago—the very moment, to be exact, that the farm policies were first announced by the Washington administration. The drought has only placed a fateful "Amen" upon the indictment long since pronounced in UNITY, and in many other papers as well. We used strong language to describe what we regarded as the silliest and also most abominable action ever taken by a serious government to meet a social crisis. But we think Dr. Tugwell has now given us stronger and more accurate language in which to voice our sentiments. The very words he hurls at his critics—"infantile, obscene, wicked"—we now most respectfully and yet emphatically address to him and his Department. "Infantile"! Yes, the AAA is "infantile," and has been from the beginning, in imagining that there is any solution of the agricultural problem in paying farmers for what they do not produce. "Obscene"! Exactly! Even a mule knows that it is "obscene" to plow under perfectly good crops in a country and at a time when millions of people are registered on semi-starvation relief rolls. "Wicked"! Yes, we call it "wicked" to curtail production in an attempt to cover up an inability, or unwillingness, to accomplish distribution at the expense of private profits and in the interest of the public good. It didn't need a drought to blast this AAA policy with failure. It was doomed from the beginning. As for the drought itself, we would remind Dr. Tugwell that, as long ago as the days of Joseph in Egypt, it was known that there are lean years as well as fat years.

In San Francisco, during the late strike, a crowd of so-called "Vigilantes" broke into the office of a radical newspaper, smashed all the furniture and paraphernalia, and beat the occupants into a bloody jelly. In Indianapolis, thousands of men and women stormed a vaudeville theatre to see the father and family of the notorious bandit and gangster, John Dillinger, recently shot down and killed in his tracks by federal police. John Dillinger, Sr., surrounded by his household, appeared twice a day in this theatre and told to gaping auditors the life story of his "boy." The Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago has offered $10,000 for the right to exhume Dillinger's body and place it on public exhibition. In Cambridge, Massachusetts, a crowd of "scores of citizens" tied a female goat, with kids, to a stake and set upon her an infuriated police dog. For fifteen minutes the crowd cheered and yelled while the goat defended its young, until at last it dropped dead from exhaustion and loss of blood. Here are three casual episodes in the days' news from West, mid-West, and East. To them might be added a lynching-bee in the South, Jean Harlow's reported fourth marriage, and the daily record of automobile killings by drunken drivers and speed maniacs. What are we to think of a people who tolerate things of this kind—indeed, enjoy them? What is the destiny of a country in which such events are possible? As we read our newspapers from day to day, we see unmistakable signs of growing degeneracy and savagery. The great mass of the American people are cruel, cynical, corrupt. They want money, pleasure, excitement, and will have them at any cost. They have no standards of good taste, no principles of morality, no spiritual ideals. What are our schools doing and what our churches, that they produce a generation like this?

Having no case of any kind for the "movies" as produced in recent years, opponents of the present decency campaign are lifting the familiar cry of censorship, and anticipating with awesome groans the spread of this campaign to the field of theaters, books, magazines, etc. To this shout of alarm, two answers may be made. First, it is a deliberate attempt to shift the issue. We do not wonder that defenders of the "movies" want to get the public talking of something else, anything else. But we will keep to the question, if you please. We will discuss these other matters if and when they are brought under attack. Meanwhile, the "movies" occupy a field of their own, have a public of their own, exert an influence of their own, and constitute at this moment the sole question before the house. Secondly, it wouldn't be a bad idea to challenge some of our contemporary books and plays in just the way that the "movies" are now being challenged. We wouldn't grieve even a little bit if great numbers of men and women bound themselves by solemn pledge not to buy books or see plays which, or patronize publishers or theatrical producers who, deliberately pander to the vilest instincts of human nature for the sake of profit. As a matter of fact, millions of people have already done this very thing in the case of the theatre. Why do the overwhelming majority of persons in New York never enter a theatre, and why is the theatre almost dead outside of New York, if not because (among other things) decent folk are tired and sick of seeing indecency paraded on the stage in the name of art? This is a sane, sensible, wholesome *boycott*. For it is a *boycott* that we are talking about in this "movie" business—not a censorship! Nobody is asking that "movie" theatres be closed, or "movies" banned, or producers interfered with in any way. The Hollywood gangsters can go right on producing all the dirty pictures they want to, and dirty people can go right on seeing these pictures. But millions of self-respecting men and women are now rising up to say that *they won't!* This is not a

censorship. It is a boycott—as good against Hollywood as against Nazi Germany. We are all for it as the one way of protecting society against savages.

Striking evidence of the sensitiveness of the church to great issues of the hour, its alertness to serve and save humanity, has recently been given by our friends, the Episcopalians. In the week that witnessed the murder of Dollfuss and the vast upheaval that threatened for a time to engulf Europe in another European war, the Episcopal church was itself convulsed by the revolutionary proposal that an archbishop be appointed here in America, to correspond with the archbishops of Canterbury and York in England. Just what this earth-shaking idea really means we do not pretend to know. Some Episcopalian leaders seem to see in it a mere change of title from Presiding Bishop to Archbishop, others a great undertaking involving the provision of a diocese, the building of a cathedral, and the raising of funds for the support of new ecclesiastical dignities. But, whatever its meaning, the stupendous significance of this suggestion in relation to the church as a vital agent of Christ's work and will, is apparent. Why, the New York newspapers have been giving more valuable space to the discussion of this topic than to any other religious topic which we can remember in recent years. Wars may come and go, economic systems may collapse and be restored, people may starve for lack of employment and income, justice may bleed and liberty perish, but there is still hope that God's Kingdom may come and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven, when a great church, faced by public indifference, social disaster, and the disintegration of its own missionary and other labors for the common good, may still get excited over the momentous question as to whether or not there shall be an American archbishop. In fairness it should be added that certain Episcopalian leaders, among them some of the best men of the church and of the nation alike, are curiously indifferent to this question, or sternly, contemptuous of it.

Our Hopes of Peace

The imminence of war today is rooted in the fact that the World War never really ended. The political and social conditions which led to the outbreak of that conflict, twenty years ago, remained unchanged after the armistice and so-called peace. Economic rivalries, imperialistic ambitions, nationalistic tensions, alliances, balances of power, *ententes,* these are with us today just as they were in 1914. In addition there are the wellnigh innumerable aggravations and complications of these conditions—such as the Saar settlement, the Upper Silesian dispute, the Polish corridor, the Austrian dismemberment—which make at once chronic and acute this ailment of war which threatens the very existence of humanity.

But this is not all! If war is imminent today, it is largely because of the exhaustion, confusion, and corruption, into which the world was cast by the impact of the 1914-1918 struggle. As a result of that terrific experience, in other words, we are infinitely weaker to resist and overcome impending disaster than we were two decades ago. In the World War we lost everything. All our ideals were swept away. With these went those established safeguards of political democracy, economic security, social order, and spiritual sanity, which for so long preserved the nations from catastrophe. Democracy has been succeeded by despotism, over vast areas of human existence; economic security has been displaced by industrial wreckage and collapse; social order has yielded to chaos, and sanity to a type of anxiety, fear, despair so close to insanity that mankind seems no longer accountable for its deeds. And all this against the background of an armed preparedness on land and sea, and in the air, which releases destructive weapons of immeasurable potency to the control of irresponsible governments and desperate peoples!

The World War did a complete job of havoc. A war "to end war," it ended peace for the lifetime at least of this generation. A war "to make the world safe for democracy," it scattered democratic principles and institutions like chaff before the wind. A war "to save civilization," it disrupted such civilization as we had won through centuries of painful struggle, and brought back the disorders and savageries of dark, barbaric times. A world so devastated is not made for peace. On the contrary, it is rife for war. If "the next war" comes, either soon or late, it will be because the last war made it inevitable. Violence, in other words, has done its perfect work.

But is there no hope for peace, no assurance that we can in any way escape an arbitrament of arms which will in this case be fatal and therefore final? The prospect seems to us to be black. Yet are there forces at work in our world which may, before it is too late, gain mastery of our lives. These forces are new to man's experience, therefore strange at the moment, but in the end potent. They seem to be three in number:

First, we are awake today to the menace of war, and therefore alert against it. Two decades ago, we were asleep. We thought we were secure;

we actually believed that, after centuries of fighting and dying, we had found our way at last to a status of enduring peace. We remember distinctly preaching a sermon in 1913 in which we prophesied that there would be no more international wars, but only class wars. Such blindness sprang, of course, from innocence, or rather ignorance. We did not know the world in which we lived. We had not uncovered the wiles of diplomacy spun like spiders' webs in every chancellery of Europe, the political and economic rivalries of all the competing nations, the mutually conflicting ambitions of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, and Russia. Especially we did not know, what some people still do not know today, that great armaments are the sure preparation not for peace at all, but war. But *now we know!* We have laid bare these grim realities of our contemporary society. Therefore, we are on the watch. Never again will war spring upon us unaware, as it did in 1914.

Secondly, we understand today, as we did not yesterday, the sheer horror and utter destructiveness of modern war. We have measured the power of the weapons in our hands, and thus know what they can do. When the Great War began just twenty years ago this month, we looked upon it as a kind of splendid and exciting game. The Germans marching west as on a parade-ground, boasted that they would be in Paris in six weeks. The French, gaudily arrayed in dress uniforms, dreamed of reaching Berlin by Christmas. The struggle could not last long, its area would be delimited, its losses not severe! Not by any mind, either military or civil, were the facts foreseen. Not in the wildest stretches of any imagination were conceived the four years of conflict, the ten millions dead and forty millions wounded, the incalculable wealth destroyed, the trench and dugout warfare, the insidious submarine campaign, the hideous bombing from the skies, the liquid fire, the poisonous gas. All this was hidden. But *it is hidden no longer!* Never again can men leap lightheartedly into war as into a grand adventure. Whereas war yesterday was a dream of heroism and glory, which we embraced with joy, it is today a nightmare of gory horror, from which we shrink in dread. All the momentum of man's higher life, once in favor of war, is now set dead against it. We have found out what war is, and therefore want no more of it.

Thirdly, there is a pacifist sentiment abroad in the world today which has never existed on any large scale hitherto. This sentiment, indigenous in every country, is strangely and wonderfully like a religion. Multitudes of men are willing not merely to live for it, but to die for it as well. Whether this pacifism is strong enough to accomplish anything decisive in the present crisis, we do not know. But it holds the same place in our world that primitive Christianity held in Rome, and to it belongs the future. This we confess—that, the longer we live, the more we seem to feel that the one sure hope we have of peace is the resolution of men *not to fight.* War will end when men end it in one great and passionate conviction of world brotherhood.

These are our hopes of peace. They are inward and spiritual in character, as the forces making for war this day are largely outward and material. What we have are the intangible, imponderable, invisible ideas, sentiments and convictions of men's hearts set against the grim realities of the economic and social system of our world. It seems a futile reliance—and so it is to the man who measures the potencies of life in terms of sticks and stones, cement and steel, guns and dynamite! But there are those in this age, as in every age, who persist in believing that ultimate power, even in this present world, lies with the spiritual forces of man's inner life. What man knows and feels and believes, and at last may will to do—it is this, as H. G. Wells points out so illuminatingly in his latest book, that moulds irresistibly "the shape of things to come." It is faith, therefore, that sustains our hope that man may live, and civilization still endure. A faith not new, but at least as old as the ancient prophet who said, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord!"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Si Vis Pacem Para Bellum

A vulture's egg that hatched a harmless dove
Would be a greater miracle by far,
Than any peace that might be sired by war;
Yet there are diplomats who seek to prove
That they can usher in the reign of love
By warfare's implements designed to scar
The souls of men, and lethal wings to mar
Men's hope of life as death drops from above.

"If you wish peace, prepare for war!" they cry;
And parliaments make haste to do their will.
Ten million helpless men are told to die,
And pacifists are warned they must keep still.
I pray you, hear my words and give them heed:
These vulture eggs will hatch a viper breed.

E. GUY TALBOTT.

Churches, Disarm!

April 29th, 1934, was a red-letter day in American religious history. The statesmanship of Everett Clinchy, who has built up the National Conference of Jews and Christians to its present eminent and commanding position, was never in fuller evidence. Brotherhood Day was celebrated all over the land. Outstanding Jews, Catholics, Protestants, both clerical and lay, voiced sentiments never before heard in such conviction and profusion from public platforms. Even to epitomize these utterances would require a large folder such as Mr. Clinchy has issued from his office recording and properly exulting in this achievement. Mass meetings were held in numerous communities where "the spirit was exceptionally fine; the audience left in an enthusiastic spirit of friendliness and good will." These audiences, mind you, were made up of Jews, Catholics and Protestants, sitting side by side, and jointly and unanimously applauding the glowing sentiments of brotherhood and universal tolerance of opinions each of all and all of each. The event is to be summed up as "a real milestone in better race and religious relations" throughout the whole land.

The thrill of it all revives memories of the high day in February of 1932 when the World's Disarmament Conference went into session in Geneva. The hopes of humanity centered there. The implements of fratricidal conflict were to be discarded. The glowing sentiments of brotherhood eloquently and unreservedly voiced by the speakers of the opening session were to become organic in the usages and institutions of the nations throughout the civilized world. The thrill of it intoxicated hardened newspaper correspondents, and broke down their chronic cynicism and reserve in reporting diplomatic confabulations. These delegates were from the people not less than from among the jugglers in cloistered chancelleries. Here at last the world had come to its senses and the mutual self-destruction by which the nations of the world had threatened the existence of human civilization was to be abandoned in the realization of that universal brotherhood which all present were so eloquent in expressing.

What, ho! That was in February of 1932. Here we are today far advanced in 1934. The Disarmament Conference in Geneva still lives. That is, it still gasps for breath, though only the determination of a few of the younger nations insures even that. The nations are more heavily armed today than they were on that day. National budgets already voted or promulgated by official ministries, provide for immensely larger expenditures for arms. Europe and Asia are both trembling on the brink of the most destructive warfare which the malice and cunning of man has yet been able to devise. The insensate joint suicide of two states and peoples of South America still goes on against the united protest of the rest of the world.

Well, well, what happened, or what didn't happen? Why, the nations did not disarm. The guileless confabulators at Geneva speedily heard from their respective governments. The orators of the opening day gradually merged into the sparring fencers of later sessions, and adjournment eventually became the only hope of saving even the nominal existence of the conference.

How far will the analogy carry? How long will the thrill of last April's Brotherhood Day among American Jews and Christians last? Yes, Mr. Clinchy and his organization will keep busy. They will call new conferences. They will revive the spirit of Brotherhood Day after its inevitable dampening in the ecclesiastical cloisters to which participants in the glorious mass meetings of April 29th retired. But their utmost efforts will be baffled just so long as those ecclesiastical cloisters remain to generate their fell atmosphere essentially and ineradicably inimical to brotherhood.

For, what do our standard ecclesiastical organizations exist for? To generate and foster the spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of tolerance for the opinions of each and all sincere souls, the spirit out of which loyal men and women are to breed the good society dedicated to truth and freedom? Ho, hum! Shall we run on with such foolish questions? What were these massive machines built for in the first place? What are they being used for now? How much of the mechanism would be left to cumber our communities if the eloquent protestations of Brotherhood Day meant all they said, and were designed to be incorporated in the standard system of organized religion in our society?

What if the Jews meant all which their spokesmen said for them? Suppose they should deliberately set about expressing in our common social life these lofty sentiments. How much would be left of the mechanism which they are now so zealously building up to solidify the loyalties of a separate race around a hereditary cultus? How long could flimsy justifications for this exclusiveness last in the clear light and clear air of a genuine brotherhood?

What if the Catholics had not returned from those mass assemblies of Brotherhood Day to exploit their fixed and inexorable doctrine that only in the true church, their church, can be found salvation in time or eternity either for the individual or society? What if under the lash of Brotherhood Day's inexorable logic the Roman Catholic hierarchy in these United States of free people should openly proclaim that this their stubbornly cherished dogma is false, and that henceforth no ecclesiastical machinery shall be permitted to exist which is designed to propagate that claim, nor will any program or policy of their organization be fostered or survive which shall be posited upon it or its implications? How much would be left of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical mechanism in this country?

And the Protestants. Perhaps I would best break in here to tell a story. Something more than twenty years ago I was an ardent young home mission board secretary. The pouring each year of hundreds of thousands of dollars of good money into bribes and subsidies and pauperizing baits to induce struggling communities to maintain feeble and competing churches of several different denominations is a revolting spectacle when observed from a distance; what it looks like when one stands close up and sees it every day must be left to the

imagination. I joined with four or five other secretaries of other denominational boards upon whom the spectacle had much the same effect that it had upon me, and we organized and secured official sanction for a series of state and district conferences in the western country where a large proportion of this money was going. We covered systematically seventeen states west of the Missouri.

To these conferences were brought the field executives of the several denominations throughout this wide territory. Though they had all for years been zealously pursuing the ostensibly common task of bringing to these thousands of communities a common faith aimed at establishing a common brotherhood, in several of these states these men had never before met in conference. Our series of meetings developed into veritable love-feasts. A new evangelism was generated. Scores of penitent confessions were openly voiced. The competitive practices by which one denomination had sought to win advantage over others were freely denounced even by those who had employed them. All but the most seasoned observers were sure that a new day had dawned over that vast home mission field.

I was clerk of the delegation of board secretaries and carried much of the correspondence both before and after the conferences. I had not yet reached my office in New York from attendance upon our field meetings before my mail became full of cynical criminations and recriminations from the denominational agents who had composed these conferences, and whose brotherly enthusiasm had seemed almost overwhelming.

You recall, (the letters would read) how A. B. spread himself at our conference at Blankburg in denouncing wasteful and sinful denominational rivalries! Well, the fellow went straight from that conference to Xville where he deliberately stole our small group of Correctists and decoyed them over into his sheep-stealing bunch of Falsarians. These are only his old tricks, by the way, and I was suspicious of his fine mouthings when I heard him at the conference.

From all quarters the same story rolled in. What had happened? Were these apparently fine fellows a bunch of hypocrites? No, at heart they were just what they appeared to be at the conferences. But they were the salaried agents of ecclesiastical machines, and they knew their job. Suppose one of them had appeared before his board, or his state committee, or his district conference, and had opened his stated report with something like this, "Brethren, in presenting this report I call you to great rejoicing. Of the fifty feeble, discouraged organizations of our denomination within our territory I have during this year successfully disbanded ten, merging their membership with other enthusiastic and loyal fellow-citizens in fellowships which are as broad and sincere as the community life itself. Henceforth petty bickering and factional contests in these fortunate communities will not center in rival churches under the sanctions of religion. In these communities from this time forward religion will not only profess brotherhood, but will be brotherhood in its organized expression. Not only this, but I have, with the blessing of God, been enabled to make such progress in the same direction among the other forty communities, which our annual subsidies have done so much to pauperize and spiritually blight, that I can give you reasonable assurance that within only a few years the last one of them will be emancipated from the bondage which we have been imposing, and will thus speedily enter into the common liberties which our gospel insures to those who sincerely believe and practice their faith."

Did anybody ever hear such a report from a home mission field agent? The fullest assurances may be offered that not one of them is that kind of a lunatic. Certain tendencies to other types of lunacy have sometimes been recklessly charged against some of them, but none ever went this kind of crazy. They know what is expected of them. They are in office to deliver the goods. And the goods are churches, and more churches; the old kept alive so long as breath can be pumped into them, and new ones brought to the birth, however feeble and unpromising today. "For, who knows but this jerk-water town where we have induced a few opinionated individuals to organize under our aegis shall ere long become a metropolis, and there we will be, on the ground floor, so to speak, able to reap abundant harvests in liberal contributions from the strong churches grown from the, far-seeing planting of today?"

To this day those machines still grind their grist in the west. Just preceding the depression there was probably more home mission money annually poured into that region than ever before in its history. The stream still flows, depleted alone by the shortage in denominational funds which the depression has brought on. The competition is as strong as ever. Since that time more than twenty years ago almost innumerable conferences have been held throughout that region, and repentant men have again and again protested against the waste and scandal of this rivalry of organizations professing the same faith. But those agents hurry forth from these new conferences to "make good" on their job. And that they will continue to do just so long as the jobs hold and sworn men are appointed to them.

But, God bless Everett Clinchy and his associates, nevertheless! Let them multiply their conferences. By all means make Brotherhood Day an annual event, and hold mass meetings in every city and town. Even Mr. Clinchy and his associates still believe in maintaining our elaborate and highly financed ecclesiastical machines, whose real and sadly successful business is to frustrate the spirit which their brotherhood mass meetings are meant to foster. These church leaders are like the statesmen who encourage and demand large national armaments to prevent war. Preparedness preserve peace! What a lady-like and lip-tickling alliteration! So, churches exist to organize men and women into mutually exclusive and narrowly creed-bound bodies, so that they may efficiently promote a gospel of universal brotherhood and good will. We have sacrificed the alliteration, but the sense is all there—and the nonsense!

But God bless these religious brotherhood conferences, anyway. It is much to the good to keep the statesmen of armed nations talking peace, and proclaiming in season and out their devotion to a warless world. If we keep them talking long enough and loud enough the inconsistency between

their words and their national policies and practices will eventually shame even them into bringing the two somewhere into the same universe of reason. If our ecclesiastical machinists can only be kept talking brotherhood and tolerance on public platforms fast enough and furiously enough the logic of these public professions will eventually filter down into the cloisters where they plot the present ecclesiastical onslaughts upon the sanctities of our common brotherhood.

For after all, these are good men. Their intelligence now apparently so deeply submerged in ecclesiastical subterfuges can eventually be reached by the processes of reason and common sense. Let them convict themselves out of their own mouths.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Woman's Part in Peace

Warfare which uses poisonous gas, infectious disease, and famine (deliberately planned), as well as the increasingly ingenious mechanism of shot and shell and of devices for hurling them, is warfare without regard to age or sex. The "next war" (if we allow such a thing to develop) will be not only man's war, but woman's war as well. Sex discriminations having been rather thoroughly eliminated in many fields, largely through woman's own desire, we are confronted now by the threat of tasting equality in the field of battle. In ultra-modern warfare there can be little choice about it. When the battlefield descends into the midst of the city and spreads through towns and villages, with foe in air and defendant on earth, there almost ceases to be any place that is not battlefield. And it must be acknowledged that any use of force in resistance, even in self-defense, is part of warfare; in other words, a defendant is a combatant. So, no matter how revolting the idea, it must be accepted that another war would draw woman in as an active participant.

Equipped with this much foresight, it becomes our responsibility to develop some insight.

Woman may have the feeling that man has bungled this war business; yet she has no ground from which to offer complaint. Even though, until recently, circumstances have prevented her from taking active part in the bungling, it has to be admitted that she has offered him very scant help in seeing war in true perspective. Under the stress of it she has encouraged him with her fortitude; she has consoled him with her pity. Both actions are unworthy of her. This use of her fortitude has helped him on to deeds that are contrary to her essential nature, and thoughts of such deeds and the results of them festering in her have produced pity—a decadent and devasting emotion. Faced now with the ominous portent of conflict among nations, much of woman's effort toward peace is motivated by this same pity, which is a negative thing—a compound of fear and horror, blended over by the tenderness of the maternal instinct. Such pity is a fungus growth from a rotting thing in our society. It is a product of war itself.

Unless woman has something stronger than this to offer, her assistance will not be sufficient to help man to check the onrushing conflict. Then once again the fortitude of her kind will be brought into action under the various guises of patriotism, duty, self-sacrifice, etc., and she will be swept with man into the greatest, and quite probably the last, of this civilization's catastrophes.

Clearly something must be done. Many who think about it are agreed that one important thing is to instill into the populace the thoughts and habits of peace. But in what way? There are two methods in general use; namely, the appeal to emotion and the appeal to reason. Casting no discredit whatever on the thousands of earnest workers for peace, it yet has to be recognized that the present state of things does not give much cause for rejoicing over accomplishment. Some new outlook is needed. May it not be woman's responsibility to supply this outlook?

For one thing the emotional appeal is surcharged with pity. Many of the pleaders for peace try to communicate their own horror of slaughter, their own protective tenderness toward suffering fellow creatures. But it is not easy to communicate such things to persons who have accepted passively the discompassionate brutality of nature from their youth up. Persons who have striven courageously with great odds in their private lives are somewhat contemptuous of pity; they do not accept it and will not give it. War itself stirs in them healthier emotions. Also it does seem quite possible that even those who are emotionally moved through pity to sign peace pledges will be even more emphatically moved (should war come) by the stronger emotions of courage, daring, lavish giving of self, etc., to lay aside the pledge and to plunge into the slaughter under the moment's madness of patriotism rampant. Obviously compassion cannot end war. Or let us have faith enough in the vigor of the human race to feel confident that it will not. Truthfully, who would boast of belonging to a race which withheld itself from action because it was too *pitiful* even to be bad? If war is a strong enemy chopping at the roots of human life, then pity is an insidious soft mildew working devastation within the trunk of the tree itself.

On the other hand, there is the appeal to reason. This is the more masculine approach to peace and is wholly commendable as far as it goes; but it is insufficient, chiefly because the populace does not move by reason. The populace is not incited to action by purely intellectual leaders. Someone must always come between such leaders and the people carrying the fire of their own instinctive natures. However, the necessity for having this go-between agency slows down the reaction—prevents it from being spontaneous. Really great leaders must be the embodiment of the folk emotion as well as of the intellectual attainment of the race. (The one great leader in the world today is such a person. Unfortunately he has to expend most of his powers of leadership on merely regaining what is the birthright of a people.) Man cannot lead by mind alone. Nor can he lead long or well by falsified surface emotions. The people instinctively scent that something is not right. And yet these are the

things that man has been trying to do for generations upon generations.

Meanwhile woman, who has longest retained the instinctive, unreasoning, emotional relation to humanity, has been coming into her intellectual heritage. Will she tragically follow man in divorcing instinct and in seeking to live by mind alone? Or will she be able to harmonize instinct and intellect and in this harmony find intuition sufficient for the guiding of a people? The fate of the white race, at least, seems to be much bound up with the answers to these questions. This is not meant to suggest that matriarchy is held to be the solution of world-ills. Far from that! Rather it is an attempt to call attention to the fact that woman is at the present the most promising instrument for creating harmony between the intellect and emotion of mankind.

There are clear indications that the germs of such harmony are active in the life of today. It is beginning to manifest itself more clearly in our art. We seem to be coming into the age of a new art, when color, form, sound, and movement will be used by artists who will work with a sure knowledge of the deep relation of these things to the nature of humanity. They will reach the people partly through the mind and partly through the body, and—causing an agreement of these—will bring into individual lives, and so into the life of the whole, greater harmony, spreading and deepening the growth of a consciousness of unity. Art functioning this way in the lives of the people is the only reliable abolisher of war.

The possible progenitors of a race of harmonious beings are among us today. Maybe the time for the appearance of such a race is nearer than we think. Undoubtedly there are many persons working alone now who need only a sign of recognition or answer from fellow workers to enkindle them into fuller utterance—more beautiful embodiment of the vision they see. Perhaps a little boy-child here, or a girl-child there, playing about unconcernedly now, has the capacity to become both Eyes and Voice for the people. But even if such a one is not yet born, nevertheless dormant within the bodies of men and women who live today lie such living cells as make each human body a prophet of more complete manhood and womanhood to be unfolded. War is indiscriminate waste of human beings—the creatures who are perhaps, the most capable of any yet evolved of knowing and expressing the meaning of the universe. Humanity is in its childhood and like a wiseacre twelve-year-old it enjoys the feeling of potency that comes with playing with fire. But what a waste of untasted maturity should the fire gain control and assert potency on its own account!

The intellect of man, having reached really respectable proportions, naturally should become the organ for conscious selection of the elements which make for growth and the discard of those which lead to destruction. If we are to be creatures of circumstance hardly more capable than the dinosaur of understanding, or even of maintaining, existence, how fruitless the pain endured by the universe in evolving an intellect. Here is man a creature capable of feeling, of knowing, and of expressing and endowed with will (paradoxically both free and otherwise!) which gives him power of putting his life into accord with the creative forces which evolved him and of becoming a meaningful expression of those forces. Without questioning the purpose of all this show of stars and microbes, we can safely assume that man's most immediate purpose should be to put his consciousness into harmony with the driving force of it all.

The majority of mankind are still incapable of such consciousness. They can best be brought toward it by having their lives surrounded by the music, dancing, painting, drama, poetry, sculpture, and so forth, of those whose lives are harmonious. Artists are leaders of the people by true "divine right." (By "artists" here is meant those beings who possess the deepest sense of unity with the rest of the universe and have through the power of will developed skill to express their vision.) The process may be a slow one. Yet one can see that only something which changes the consciousness of the people can really be effective.

But in the meantime the populace is ever possessed of the ability to act. On emotional urge they will follow blindly certain discordant individuals whose self-centered interests would impel the race into disaster. Because nature is prolific, bounteous, extravagant, life ever carries within it the instruments of its own destruction. The artist consciousness leads toward growth; the self-centered consciousness motivated by greed leads to destruction of the host it is parasite upon and so ultimately to its own annhilation. Today wealth is so unevenly divided that for the self-interest of many people war is beginning to be desirable; desirable for the supermonied persons that they may divert public attention from their accumulated riches, and for the unemployed that they may get jobs and feel again the "prosperity" of war—and post-war times. It is, of course, obvious that making a war now would be dodging the issue, merely alleviating one evil by substituting another. The great majority of the people do not want war. They look for some wiser way out of the present stress and discomfiture. Is that great majority going to sit by, helplessly watching, while the world is drawn into a cataclysm, which would in all probability end in chaos for the white race and in much damage to the others as well? It is late now to check what is on its way. But it is not too late for hope, and so for work. Let us hope that man's intellect will find a successful way to untangle the present distressful situation. But can we hope that doing this will put an end to wars? We cannot. What then is to be done?

Women form at least fifty per cent (let us say, at rough guess) of the world's population. They have almost limitless power . . . such power as they hardly dream of. And in the last analysis it is up to them to determine whether or not peace is to come on earth.

Scientific ingenuity is not likely to invent any device for turning out ready made adults. So no matter how much the industrial age has altered her duties and occupations, there has been left to woman nonetheless the ancient responsibility of bearing and rearing the young of mankind. Never for a moment can she safely disregard the stupendous significance of her task. Now it scarcely seems

to be realized how much the peace of the world is dependent upon the intelligent and loving direction of little children through the troublous times of the years between two and four. It is our responsibility to understand the lives that come into our care. It seems unreasonable for women to expect that they can assist grown men toward living peaceably if they cannot, with equanimity and understanding, dissolve the quarrels of their small sons. No matter how well modern education has taken over unto itself many of the old duties of the home, we still must recognize that the development of character in the child (and the child is as ever the "father of the man") is more intimately affected by the person who attends him at meals and at bed time and directs his leisure time activities than it is upon schools no matter how understanding and efficient these may be. (And it may well be noted here that the woman who abandons the jazz-squawking programs of the radio and makes some constructive effort to bring the music of masters into the life of her family is doing no small thing in the cause of peace).

Modern psychology offers some assistance. The problem involved is to take this psychology seriously enough without taking it too seriously. Any movement whose goal is adjustment and happiness, and whose method is to dig up the race's elemental urges and to adapt education to a satisfaction of these urges without taking into consideration mankind's potentialities for conscious direction of transformations in his nature, is a downward movement. We cannot disregard the elemental—woman knows that—and must never forget it. But neither can we make the elemental the dictator to the conscious mind, as is so often the paradoxical tendency in modern mind-made psychology. In a healthy growing race the elemental and intellectual must work in indivisible co-operation, interdependent but with neither superimposed upon the other.

Mothers, like the rest of human beings, are endowed with intellectual capacity as well as with emotion, and can meet their problems most successfully by bringing both into play. But this concerns not only mothers. Every woman who has *any* relationship whatsoever with children is honorbound by her womanhood to make use of the available intellectual material in regard to childhood. Happy is she and happy will be her race if she can so co-ordinate the intaken knowledge with the instinctive urges of her own nature that the harmony of her life can be infused into the lives of the sons and daughters of the race.

To create a humanity capable of perceiving and expressing its harmonious relation in the life of the universe, seems to be the only really good reason for desiring to save this humanity from devastation. Staying out of war because it terrifies us and horrifies us is not sufficient reason. We would do just as well to abandon mankind to total destruction by war as to allow ourselves to be overruled by our fears and have them finally destroy us from within. Real progress toward peace cannot be made by counteracting war, but only by the releasing of creative energies.

Woman's part then in the movement toward peace is: to attain within her own life co-ordination of her intellectual and emotional faculties; to subordinate her personal desires and difficulties to the necessities of the race; to quiet the tumult within herself and become a creator; to resume the dignity of her everlasting calling as the mother of mankind. And in so doing she will find that she has "expressed herself" and has become possessed of the joy and zest of life, which she now so vainly pursues.

So the real issue has very little to do with the immediate personal suffering caused by warfare. Rather the question looms: Have we sufficient confidence in the potentialities of humanity to succeed in leading it away from self-annihilation by moving it toward the realization of its own innate creativeness? Well—have we?

By a Woman.

Einstein's Pacifism and the Jews

There is no concealing the fact that the international anti-militarist world, the world of intelligent and humane idealism which is represented in every civilized nation, even the most evidently militarized,—such as Russia, Italy, Germany, Japan,—has been dismayed by the altered attitude—the alleged "apostasy"—of Dr. Albert Einstein to the categorical renunciation of war. For he has apparently "revised" his famous confession of faith, his positive declarations, concerning the individual duty of civilized men when confronted by the atavism, the monstrous imperatives and atrocious demands of tribal nationalism and the war-machine, since his unhappy encounters with its manifestations in Germany. And what is revisionist pacifism?

Only a few months before the accession of the neo-paganism and egocentric brutality of Hitlerism, the famous philosopher-physicist—hailed as the world's greatest living savant—was bravely proclaiming the virtue and efficacy of individual super-resistance to war, of conscientious refusal to surrender to the blind and bloody requirements of military authority—to war-service, or military training for war-service, in the armies of the lawless, *soi-disant* civilized states of Europe and America. Einstein voluntarily placed himself and his great intellectual prestige at the head of this "100 per cent. pacifist" movement for moral and physical disarmament—and at the service of the War-Resisters' Internationale which, with headquarters in London, has valiantly endeavored, with little means, to knit together the conscientious objectors of more than a dozen countries, in many of which young men are enduring actual imprisonment, and all manner of obloquy and economic discrimination, year in and year out, because of their resolute determination to yield nothing to the exactions of military superstition and barbarism.

The letter which Prof. Einstein wrote to the conference of the War-Resisters' Internationale, in August, 1931, was explicit, scorching, and to many persons, convincing. Its eloquence, and the author's eminence, carried its challenge literally around the world: the message was translated into half a dozen languages, and its writer cheerfully incurred, and philosophically

accepted, for a time, the anathema of professional patriots and glowing nationalist zealots everywhere, particularly in Germany, where he was then resident. Prof. Einstein wrote on that occasion:

All the nations of the world are talking about disarmament. You must lead them to do more than talk. The people must take this matter out of the hands of statesmen and diplomats. They must grip it in their own hands.

Those who think that the danger of War is past are living in a fool's paradise. We have today to face a militarism far more powerful and destructive than the militarism which brought the disaster of the Great War.

You must call upon the workers of all countries unitedly to refuse to become the tools of death-dealing interests. There are young men in twelve countries who are resisting conscription by refusal to do military service. They are the pioneers of a warless world. Every sincere friend of peace must support them, and help to arouse the moral conviction of the world against conscription.

I appeal especially to the intellectuals of the world. I appeal to my fellow-scientists to refuse to co-operate in research, for war purposes. I appeal to the preachers to seek truth, and to renounce national prejudices. I appeal to the men of letters to declare themselves unequivocally. I ask every newspaper which prides itself on supporting peace to encourage the peoples to refuse war service. I ask editors to challenge men of eminence and of influence by asking them bluntly, "Where do you stand? Must you wait for everyone else to disarm before you put down your weapons and hold out the hand of friendship?

This is no time for temporizing. You are either for war or against war. If you are for war, you must encourage science, finance, industry, religion, and labor, to exert their power to make your national armaments as efficient and deadly as they can be made. If you are against war, you must encourage them to resist it to the uttermost. I ask everyone who reads these words to make this great and definite decision.

Let this generation take the greatest step forward ever made in the life of man. Let it contribute to those who follow, the inestimable sight of a world in which the barbarity of war has been forever renounced. We can do it if we will. It requires only that all who hate war shall have the courage to say that they will not have war!

I appeal to all men and women, whether they be eminent or humble, to declare, before the World Disarmament Conference meeting at Geneva, that they will refuse to give any further assistance to war or to the preparations for war.

Einstein added to this ringing declaration, the statistical observation that, if but 3 per cent. of the people of any nation would make this declaration, and adhere to it, warfare would immediately become impossible, if only because there are not jails or prisons enough to hold even so small a fraction of the populations. Certain pacifist groups, with more ardor than humor, promptly issued small white and gold buttons, bearing the cryptic figure, 3 per cent., and began to wear them upon their lapels—oblivious of the fact that, at least to most Americans who saw them, the wearers appeared to be advertising rather their devotion to 3 per cent. beer!

But all this was before the startling cabal of political adventurers and propagandists, led by an ex-Austrian house-painter turned mesmerist, with a flair for brown shirts, hooked crosses, and shiny boots, had captured the German governmental apparatus and, by organized bullying, bravoura and brutality, had inflamed or intimidated an entire nation and clapped more than fifty thousand "conscientious objectors" to their primitive methods and myths into various concentration camps after jails and prisons had overflowed. Three per cent. of the German population would, it is true, amount to about two million persons; and far more than this number unquestionably did not give their consent, but rather were opposed to Hitler and his minions when they rode into power. Being disorganized and divided among themselves, however, and deceived by their trust in a paper constitution and the pledges of an aged president, the opposition was ineffective, and it rapidly crumbled away. This fact is of some interest—or ought to be—to those who are tempted to believe that three per cent. of a nation's population, by merely signing a pledge, can certainly prevent the perpetration of acts of civil or international war.

The matter is not so simple as that—especially in countries inured to autocracy, where public and private opinion can be easily controlled, censored and gulled. Three per cent. of a nation's population, *if organized, and if politically active and intelligently led,* in unified opposition to war, could write,—and at intervals has written,—a very different history. Is so much political intelligence and moral activity too much to hope for—when an international crisis arises, and most of the newspapers, cunningly aided, or secretly subsidized, by the armament manufacturers and other largely influential industrial and financial interests, call for violence, in the name of national honor? Too much, indeed! . . . such, at least, has been the history of the world, with rare exceptions, for a long, long time. All the more remarkable, then, and assuredly all the more justified, this moving appeal from a recognized leader of human thought, in a lull between the appalling periods of recurrent carnage, to the younger workers and thinkers of all the civilized world,—to those who suffer most and are most stultified and betrayed by war,—to unite in resisting it with their minds and bodies, before both are destroyed!

II

What, then, was the bewilderment of thinkers and workers of humane convictions throughout the Occident to read, as millions of them read, in September, 1933, newspaper dispatches from Belgium announcing that Prof. Einstein had altered his attitude towards conscientious objectors to military service, at least to military service in the armies of Belgium, in time of peace, and, by the implication, of a letter addressed to M. Alfred Nahon, a well-known Belgian anti-militarist, published in the Brussels newspaper *Patrie Humaine,* recognized the need for military preparations against the armed terror that ruled Germany! The report seemed utterly incredible; and jingo newspapers like the *Chicago Tribune* chortled with satisfaction at the famous philosopher's discovery of "new reasons for war." That master of contumely promptly published on its front page a cartoon, depicting the savant at a telescope pointing from the Earth toward the planet Mars, with the superscription: "Einstein Discovers a New Planet"; it published, also, an editorial frying the bacon of satisfaction over the scientist's change of mind, and over the "relativism" of his ethical views, following closely upon his personal experience of persecution and spoilation. The editor ended his homily with a sentence that was an unusually malicious and perverted example of *Tribune* editorializing—to wit: "Now that he admits that he was wrong on pacifism, he should also realize that he was wrong on Communism, and, a refugee, cease preaching the overthrow of the government that has given him asylum."

This imputation was both insulting and untrue, of course,—yet politely phrased protests to the editors were not even printed in their letter-column. (So much for the liberty of the press under the Constitution, loudly trumpeted by the editor of the *Tribune*!) . . . Reading the disturbing report from Belgium in the *Tribune's* columns, we naturally discounted it and

looked elsewhere for confirmation. We found, in an obscure corner of page 10, of the September 12th issue of the *New York Times,* the following cautious paragraph, under a Berlin date-line:

Another paper (in Berlin) charges that a letter was recently written by Dr. Einstein to a certain M. Nahon of Belgium, in which Dr. Einstein is alleged to have said that if Belgium were to go to war with Germany, and if he were a Belgian, he would, under the existing circumstances, unhesitatingly offer himself for war service, despite his otherwise strongly pacifist convictions.

The difference in style and treatment of this report, as published in the *Tribune* and the *Times,*—was a striking example of the very human, and unscientific, way in which editorial prejudices are permitted to color, or discolor, news and facts. Yet the *Tribune's* dispatch came directly from Brussels; it quoted paragraphs from the purported letter, in which Dr. Einstein declined to accede to a request to intervene in behalf of two imprisoned Belgian conscientious objectors to military conscription, who were launched upon a hunger strike against their tormentors. He gave certain reasons for his declination. The cabled version of the letter ran as follows:

Warns of German Danger

You will be very astonished at what I am going to tell you (Prof. Einstein wrote). Only a short time ago we could hope to fight militarism in Europe successfully by individual refusals to do service. But today we are in the presence of altogether different circumstances. There is in the center of Europe a state (Germany) which is publicly preparing for war by all means.

In these conditions the Latin countries, above all France and Belgium, are in great danger and can only count on their preparedness.

As far as Belgium is concerned it is obvious that this little country will not make abusive use of its preparation and that it has the greatest need to safeguard its existence.

Imagine Belgium occupied by present-day Germany! It would undoubtedly be worse than in 1914, even though occupation at that time was terrible. That is why I am telling you in the most direct fashion that if I were a Belgian I would not refuse to do military service under the present circumstances, but on the contrary I would accept it in full conscience with the feeling that I was contributing to save European civilization.

This does not mean I am renouncing my former opinion. I desire nothing more than to see the moment return when refusal to do military service could be the means of an efficacious fight for the progress of humanity.

III

It would be interesting to know, if psychological insight were really permitted us, exactly what influences, experiences, reflections, or what storms of emotion, passed through the alembic of the mind of Einstein between August, 1931, when he wrote to the War-risters' Internationale, and September, 1933, when he wrote to M. Nahon, that the ethical distillate of its thought concerning human nature and political and moral duty, emerging in words so different in color, should so change, as one might say, from a crystalline, prophetic white to a cloudy and conventional blue,—or red! Obviously, the political mind and face of Germany had been convulsed, in the space of these months. A long-suffering, orderly and hopeful republicanism had broken down into a brutal, belligerent and fanatical dictatorship. But why had the nature of political duty, the power of human example and protest, or the efficacy of individual moral, intellectual and corporeal opposition to militarism changed, in the mind of a philosopher? That is the question!

And this: Had Einstein ever, really, espoused a profound, or religious, or intellectual conviction of pacifism, as a doctrine, a faith, or a way of life? A devotee of truth cannot be an opportunist, in the sense that a politician, and even a statesman, must sometimes be. Has he, then, some misgiving that German human nature is different from extra-German human nature. Has he any doubts that it will respond to truth, to the appeals of justice, kindness and good faith, any less readily than other? Or did he, dropping into his relativistic habit of mind, with which he had made certain remarkable, theoretical conquests of the cosmos, mean to confess that, in his opinion, ethical principles, likewise, on the toadstool of this earth, are merely relative and conventional matters, appropriate to the angle of vision and the cultural or political status of the actor and the citizen—and that what was profoundly true, imperative, and praiseworthy, in Europe, in 1932, has become erroneous, impotent and quixotic, in 1934? . . . Or does he think that the example of resolute opposition to military illusions, mechanisms, and war-preparedness, presented by true conscientious objectors everywhere, who are capable of imaginative, informed and disinterested thinking, is something to be encouraged east of the Rhine, but discouraged west of it? If so, how can he, or any man, sincerely propose to encourage it, east of the Rhine, while discountenancing it to the west? . . .

Obviously, the most encouraging news emanating from the psychotic, emotion-ridden arena of Germany today is the word that there are, at least, 60,000 conscientious objectors, of one kind or another, to Hitlerism—men and women who are not deceived or drugged by its atavistic propaganda, who cannot be counted upon to execute its political felonies, at home or abroad, and who are, therefore, imprisoned, or in jeopardy of being incarcerated, in the Siberian isolation of numerous "concentration camps,"—without right to *habeas corpus* liberations or to any jury trial,—lest they impede, by their activities and the free circulation of their opinions, the moral consolidation of the "totalitarian" absolutism of the Hegelian-Hitlerite State-idea, or arouse some resistance to its *Schrecklichkeit.* Would not every consideration of logic and of rational consistency, therefore, lead Prof. Einstein—and the more so because of his tragic personal and racial experiences with this furious delusion—to stress the importance of the service which these persecuted non-conformists and political resisters are rendering to truth, to liberty, to Germany, and to the defense of Europe and Civilization—and to seek ways and means of encouraging them, of communicating with them, and of relieving their misery? Is any committee, of Jews or Gentiles, seeking to do this very useful thing? Are not these men suffering more terribly, and rendering a greater service to Europe and to the future, than are the fugitives who have been able to flee the country? To strengthen the minds and fortify the spirits of resisters to tyranny, injustice, fanaticism and war-mindedness—i. e., opponents of the monstrous superstitions of the military State and its machinery, cannot be done by drawing any hypothetical line between civilization and barbarism at the Rhine, as Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn professes to do,—most regrettably,—in a sensational article in a recent issue of Harper's Magazine. It cannot be done by observing that nothing must be done to weaken the military preparations of states *west* of the Rhine. It *can* be done everywhere, or nowhere, from Tokyo to Moscow, wherever the spirit of freedom and of truth, of trust and good-will towards men beyond a linguistic

or political boundary-line, ventures to raise up advocates against the pagan,—or Old Testament,—idea that youth owes some sacred obligation to blind and sacrifice itself at the stake of military, or tribal, "duty," or upon the bloody and brazen altars of old men who have built and operated, and grown fat upon the profits of, a military conspiracy or a political machine in *de facto* possession of what is called the State.

It is not easy to encourage resistance to any government—even the most despotic. When the despotism enjoys the favor of the rich and powerful, even in so-called democratic countries, and of all those who believe that it is very important that trains should run on time,—even if liberty is stifled,—and when the despotism has for mouthpiece a demagog whom millions follow with ecstatic acclaim, and believe in devoutly, as Jews are supposed, long ago, to have believed in Daniel, when they writhed under the heel of an Assyrian oppressor, it is still more difficult. The German people have surrendered to dangerous illusions of self-pity and martyrdom, indulging fevered day-dreams in their desire to escape from Fate, from themselves, and from their sharp sense of humiliation and national frustration. It must be clear, I think, that the "civilized minority" among them—whether in concentration camps or in circulation—are "a saving remnant," and an embattled force for wisdom and true patriotism, whom it should be our duty to rescue and to strengthen if possible. This cannot be done by refusing to strengthen those of similar mentality here. How, then, can they be reached and strengthened? How, save by a policy of peace-education and forbearance, at home and abroad,—by seeking to deal economic justice to Germany; by promoting a real, an honest, and a fearless, disarmament, on our side and theirs; and by resolute refusal to make any military concessions to Hitler? Instead of this, we have seen the British timidly negotiating for an enlargement of German arms and armies,—saying nothing whatever about a restoration of colonial privileges, which were ruthlessly seized from Germany, at Versailles, and before. And we have seen all the efforts for disarmament lanquish, and no steadfast endeavor to give to France the political assurances of support, in the event of unprovoked attack, to which her people—and all peoples similarly situated and similarly apprehensive—are unquestionably entitled.

Is it not incontrovertible that by some genuine act of disarmament, and of political assurance of our effective support of peace, by resolute suppression of the vicious trade in arms and war supplies, and by requiring of Hitler, and of ourselves, submission to an international régime of disarmament—is it not evident that these measures,—and not arming against him, or permitting him to re-arm,—are the sovereign remedies for Hitlerism and for the salvation of Europe? May we suggest to Prof. Einstein, and to the large committees who are seeking to aid the fugitive Jews from Germany, that he and they could do nothing so effective for their colleagues in Germany, and for the future of mankind, as to make of themselves mouthpieces of such wisdom as this, rather than instruments for promoting a general boycott against all German goods and services—a boycott whose spirit is hatred and whose consequences are incalculable? An embargo laid down against one's own countrymen, by law and public opinion, aiming to prevent them from becoming selfish aggressors and abettors with arms or monies against the peace and security of other nations and governments is one thing, and a good thing. But an international boycott affecting a whole nation, and exasperating it still further, is quite another. . . For what, then, does the voice of Israel stand and speak in this most tragic hour of fanaticisms and rumors of war? Einstein is silent, or silenced; and the testimony of the leaders of Israel is not clear, or conspicuously identified with those who are laboring in the vineyard for peace and for understanding of the psychosis which is Germany, under the evil spells of militarism and of Hitler.

The things that Hitler *says* he wants for Germany are largely righteous things. Is it not the duty of the peacemakers, then, to urge that they be given to her,—and that arms be refused him? The road to real disarmament, to the suppression of the trade in munitions of war, to the organization of a genuine international government, democratically constituted, is the road towards the frustration of Fascism. Let us take it, without fear.

BRENT DOW ALLISON.

Tissaphernes

I am the maker of trouble, I brew the foul broth of suspicion;
Mine is the joy of the ill, and my happiness issues in quarrels,
Master of intrigue and hate, and the builder of barriers of passion,
Wide my domain as the seas and the lands of the earth all-embracing.
Gladly I broadcast the teeth of the dragon and wait for the harvest,
Watching the swords as they sprout in the gardens of national hatreds,
Happy when troubles abound, and thrice happy when wars are impending.
Soft to my listening ear are the blasts of machine gun and cannon,
Sweet to my nostrils the fumes of the gas and the stench of the trenches.
Working in secret I plot the extension of armies and navies,
Playing on credulous fears and depicting the glories of conquest,
Calling the flag to my aid and enlisting the youth in my cohorts.
So I prolong my regime and extend over all men my power,
Binding on mankind new burdens and threatening civilization,
I, Tissaphernes, the mixer of hatreds and breeder of mischiefs,
I,
The Omnipotent One,
Tissaphernes,
The Armament Maker.

A. E. BRUCE.

1914-1934

The viper, War, was wounded, not killed.
He sulked in a hole and found a mate,
A slimy, venomous reptile, Hate.
Their wedding wine was blood we spilled
From the patriot youth of frenzied lands
At sordid rulers' wild demands.
Their banquet was laid for corpse and ghost
The golden manhood of lunacy's boast.
They've hatched their eggs since armistice year
A squirming progeny, nourished in greed
Who now abolish crawling fear
In their hunger for human cannon feed.
Shall the idiot guards of a civilized world
Remain asleep while poison is hurled?
Anemic dullards whose blood will not boil,
Do we vapidly wonder at hiss and coil?

MARGARET LATHROP LAW.

San Francisco Tells the World

Current events become ancient history in a few weeks now. The world waits breathlessly on San Francisco at an hour when anything seems possible there, even to the leading of a nation-wide labor revolution. Ten days afterwards, here in California, the killing of the outlaw, John Dillinger, pushes the labor news off the front page, and the daily press is *back to normalcy*. Another week, and Civil War in Austria, with a recurrence of the World War, on a larger scale, in prospect, has the right of way in public prints. And before this article appears accident, scandal, and murders may again assure us that the ordinary life of our Christian civilization is on its routine course. Truly we are living in quick, if not in quickening times.

Yet there is no such suddenness and abruptness in the currents of events as thus superficially appears. The San Francisco strike did not just happen, nor did it spring out of the earth as though summoned by some maliciously magic hand. It was, in fact, as the news reports themselves indicated, an incident, however large the scale on which the incident was drawn, of the labor movement of the whole Pacific Coast, and, for that matter, of the country-wide effort of organized labor to hold the Federal Government to the first accepted meaning of the labor code in the NRA. And the present aftermath of lawless rioting, on the part of the professed guardians of law and order, against the Communists, is only superficially an emotional reaction to the inevitable retreat from the General Strike front. It was deliberately planned and carefully prepared by the Chambers of Commerce in all the major horticultural sections of California months ago, before the labor upset in the metropolitan centers had so much as been hinted in the public news columns.

On my way up from Los Angeles, in March of this year, I was tipped off by a minister, who is far removed from either sensationalism or violent militancy, that five California counties, including that in which he is resident, had openly organized Vigilante Committees running into the hundreds of respectable citizens, and were moving in such concert of action toward utmost violence against anyone who interfered with their exploitation of unorganized and generally alien labor that the word had been passed around in his neighborhood, "This community has nothing to do with the matter *except to furnish the coroners, and we will do the rest.*" There was no concealment in this county in which I am myself resident that such was the spirit and purpose of respectable citizenship here, under like leadership from Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade. Objection to aliens was limited to those who got in the way of slave-employment for other aliens, welcome always to the degree that they submit without protest to whatever the master-class deigns to allow them. The alien-deportation drive with respect to Communists which is on at the present hour is merely a phase of the general hypocrisy of the ruling class.

Nevertheless, great as the temptation is to deal in moral terms when confronted with the violences and pretenses of those who pose as the defenders of law and order and religion, it is a mistake to so confuse the issues which underlie the whole situation, whether in the industrial city-centers or in agricultural and horticultural areas. The "baddish-goodish," and "goodish-baddish" explanation of human affairs as they stand in these unhappy times, to which Mr. H. G. Wells resorts in his "only article written by Mr. Wells during his recent visit to the United States," as set forth in the August issue of the *American Magazine*, is as superficial as is most of our ideological stuff. The matter is much more material than such terms allow. There was plenty of both "goodish-baddish," and "baddish-goodish," in the San Francisco drama, so much indeed that all the big and little followers of Mr. Wells' *muddle-class minds*, as they ought to be described, fail to see this day what the actual workings of the crisis, and the prelude period which led up to the crisis, truly were.

The fight was not originally and fundamentally between men, on the one side or the other, but between elemental economic forces involved in artificial conflicts which made of the passions of men, and of their very virtues, if you will, playthings and tools, to the undoing of both human and material values. Here, for instance, was labor, at the supreme moment of the vast funeral cortege which followed the caskets of the two hitherto obscure men who fell as victims of police sadism and stupidity on "bloody Thursday." Nothing like it has ever been seen in an American city before, since ever American cities were, for size, for such majestic silence, self-control, and dignity of a marching labor host. The very self-control of it was terrifying to the arrogant owners of San Francisco's wealth and official power. There is no describing it; even those who were of it were amazed and awed by it. Mass humanity, in working clothes, spoke a sublimity of human fellowship in its basic manifestations which words utterly fail to tell. Yet these were the same people our power-proud Governor-ad-interim prepared to crush under martial law a few days later unless they bowed the knee to the Baal of property which he serves. The Governor himself, within a narrow individual and community area, is not an evil-minded man. He can teach his Presbyterian Sunday School class with moral mediocrities and theological traditionalisms in a way to serve personal proprieties and pieties that do not challenge social iniquities undiscerned or studiously ignored. In this respect he is not noticeably different from the members of the Vigilante Committees who are identifying serving God with saving their crops and dividends. If they are "baddish-goodish," or "goodish-baddish" their mongrel morality is resultant upon the kind of an economic corral in which they are penned up in the midst of our capitalist chaos.

There was, in truth, on the part of the masses involved in the San Francisco strike, a remarkable self-control throughout. Such violence as occurred was mainly due to official blundering, and to the cultivated sadism of our soldiery, whether named police or National Guards. There is a streak of savagery in all of us which manifests all too readily when it is decorated with official insignia, certified by authority in high places, and animated by cowardice, cupidity, and the lust for power. California abounds in situations of economic stress which gives opportunity for the play of all these vestigal remnants of our animal ancestry, compounded with the more than bestial brutalities of expanded appetite and organized fatuousness and pride.

The thing that thus far no one whom I have read or heard has made prominent, if mentioned at all, is that in the background of all the violence there was an unacknowledged pitting of working masses against

working masses which was used by the owning class, to create the chaos which threatened general destructiveness for a time, and to crush labor later under this excuse.

Had there been no unemployed labor in and around San Francisco there would have been no more violence than there was when the great funeral cortege held the city in awed calm. When the General Strike went into effect the city had a Sabbath quietness upon it, so strange, so sepulchrally calm that the Sabbath analogy failed, and some there were who expressed their reaction to the impressive phenomenon by affirming that the usually throbbing town was "like a morgue." Street cars were missing; trucks had ceased to run; even the automobiles were infrequent by reason of the gas-famine that was imminent. Labor had no desire to raise a ruction, and the authorities had yet no opportunity to demonstrate their habitual itch for parade and intimidation. The strikers were willing, too willing from the viewpoint of a rigid military strategy such as is commonly employed against them, to see to it that milk supplies, hospital needs, and the actual feeding of the people were not stalled by the strike. Community dependence upon labor was made evident enough, but labor was too lenient to let that dependence do its work to the utmost, particularly at those points where labor serves most obscurely and with most contemptible reward the primary needs of mankind.

But it was labor against labor that was the weakness of the strikers and the strength of the authorities. Neither the owners of ships and commerce, nor the political figure-heads who wait upon economic power, could have availed, with all the servile soldiery and police at their command, if organized labor were not beset with unorganized want and hunger from among fellow workers who have been robbed of their right to work.

Years ago a certain Baptist minister, who had a flare for pious profession and devotional publicity tarried for a time on the Pacific Coast. After a brief period in the Northwest he came down to California, seeking a pulpit here. He had opportunity to preach for a Sunday or two at a point between San Francisco and Los Angeles where the church was about to call another man to its pulpit. The out-sider from Oregon quietly intimated that he would be glad to accept the pulpit himself, at a lesser salary than it was proposed to pay the man whom the church had in mind to call. The proposition, though adroitly made, killed the man who made it, not only for the pulpit on which he sought to "scab," but it killed him for every other pulpit on the Coast, so that he had to return to the East. A "scab preacher" would not be tolerated.

Yet it was a president of Harvard College who described the ordinary labor scab as a "hero." Unfortunately California is full of such "heroes" today, who know themselves for the pitiful slaves and betrayers of their fellow workers they are. It is starved labor against half-starved labor which speaks out of San Francisco, and out of every strike situation of our day. Were all starved equally, and employed equally, there would be no scabs to break strikes, and the folded arms of the workers would bring the proudest of the plunderbund to their knees. Police and soldiery would have to chew the cud of their sadistic lust for blood with no workmen's heads to crack or gas-driven pickets to shoot down. All this pride of power is a vain show, for without the tens of thousands of workless men and women, wrecked in will and self respect, as well as in fortune and fare, mayors and governors and their fascist underlings would wait on their own garbage cans, do their own trucking and carrying, and raise their own garden stuff, or stand hat in hand before labor.

San Francsico, above all the commonplace comment on the superficialties of strike and "revolution," and other incidentals of industrial upheaval, tells the world of far more fundamental things. The labor solidarity which resisted so effectively the blandishments of local, State, and Federal officialdom, and the pleas of priesthood backed by every circumstance of polite palaver that evaded the fundamental issue; the unforgettable memorial which labor demonstrated over its foully murdered dead, refusing, as labor did, the offers of official guards for the funeral procession, of flowers, and money, proffered by the city authorities; the manner in which its own officialdom was brushed aside until the General Strike was in actual operation; all this and more marks a growing realism in the rank and file of American workers which will not wait forever on power, either political or economic. There is ground for the widespread conviction that at the last the General Strike was betrayed in labor's own precincts, taken over by the officialdom which could not stay it, and so contrived to lead it into the camp of the enemy at length. Probably the end could not have been otherwise at this time.

But to say "the end," is itself a mistake. Whether the public, the politicians, and the privileged in the economic field have learned anything is yet to be proven. Labor has learned much, and is learning more every day. Violence is not with labor. Betrayal is not stronger than self-effacing comradeship in labor. Compromise cannot continually have its way with labor. Religion may count its beads, and authority may count its gas bombs and guns, and the press may count its pennies, the wages of social prostitution, and the public may count convenience more than conviction, but San Francisco tells the world that labor counts either success or defeat in its protest against the intolerable disorder and inexcusable distress amidst which the workers live only another step toward the strategy of a complete overthrow of those who rule the world to the common ruin. It has been worth much to live through the General Strike in San Francisco.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Proposed Roads to a Better Social Order

No. 10—Equitism

To a considerable extent inharmony has marked the inter-relations of humans since the dawn of history, and in the present time it has become very marked in a number of ways. Military warfare is one of the extreme manifestations of that inharmony. The so-called class struggle which Socialists and others note, is a common many-form manifestation of that inharmony pervading human affairs. Inharmony between humans thus being so common under the various forms of civilization so far attained, it is evident that there

must be something common to all social orders yet attained, that is conducive to conflict between humans. A careful noting of their principal features reveals that all have involved the rule of some persons over other sane adults. And a still closer observation reveals the fact that one phase of such rulership is the requirement that some sane adults serve other such persons without those others serving the former in return.

It has been and is the habit to assume that the way to determine equivalence in trade is to use some form of comparison of results—as in comparing the quantity or quality of goods. But as every product contains something that is not human service, such a custom of pricing according to results automatically puts a price on what is not human service. To pay that price some must serve others without being served in return. That automatically puts humans into antagonistic positions, thus practically forcing each to get others to serve her or him as slaves in order to avoid herself or himself having to serve them as a slave. That furnishes an all-sufficient incentive to monopolize natural resources, and to establish and control political or other forms of official or semi-official governments of some over others. It is the economic basis of the *un*equal freedom now world-wide. And any monetary unit that represents anything else than a definite duration of the service of sane adults must function so as to require some of its users to serve others of them as slaves.

Human freedom must either be *equal or un*equal. So far humanity has experienced various forms of the latter. But Equitism is based on the concept that *equal freedom* for all the mentally fairly normal adult humans throughout the world is the *necessary* foundation for the building of a truly harmonious, thoroughly beneficial to all, civilization. It involves the idea that each sane adult must assume the full responsibility of so guiding her or his own actions as to avoid in any manner infringing the equal freedom of any other such person. That requires, automatically, that *all* non-gift serving of some sane adults by other such persons be done on the basis of equal duration of service from the served to the server in return for the latter's service. That means that all prices must be fixed at the actual duration of the work (service) of sane adults going into the thing produced or the act performed. That means genuine hour-for-hour *exchange* of services.

The Equitist Way provides the general basic mechanism necessary for the practical application of the idea of *equal freedom* to a literate, mechanically advanced population. It provides for such portions of the earth's surface, or subsurface, as cannot be exclusively held privately without infringing the equality of freedom of others, being held in common and maintained in suitable condition under the administration of persons elected* by the sane adult population of the territory involved. The cost being apportioned equally among the persons forming the said adult population. That would be the public administration, having charge of all forms of common highways, land, water, air.

Land, whether surface or subsurface, would be held, but not owned, on an occupancy and use basis; and pass from one to another without price when title thereto was transferred. Where desired subsurface and surface use of the same area by different persons could be arranged between them to their mutual satisfaction. What was needed for highways—including docking places for water-going vessels and landing places for air-going ones—and parks would be held by the public administrative territorial units. What was needed by the banks would be held by them, and what was needed by private individuals and groups for homes, places of business, club and other purposes would be held by the particular individuals and groups. Land not, at the time, specifically, required by any person or group would be held publicly subject to being taken for any public or private use at any time, as occasion arose. Naturally, for convenience, records of lands and their holders would be kept in the public administrative offices.

On the fiscal side the Equitist Way provides for Equitist Mutual Credit Exchange Banks, to which every sane adult, also every other fiscal entity, would belong. Such individual banks would be federated into larger groups with suitable inter-bank clearing-houses according to the requirements for convenience in handling checks. All monetary transactions would be by check. Whenever any person or other fiscal entity wished to purchase the services (direct or embodied in products) of another or others, she, he or it would issue a check for the sum involved, and the receiver thereof would deposit it in her, his or its own bank. And the accounts would be suitably debited and credited as between the parties involved.

Upon coming of age a person would join such a mutual bank, agreeing to issue and redeem all her or his checks on the basis of one monetary unit (the dollar, for instance) representing one hour of the work of sane adults. The account would start blank and any checks issued against it would mean debit entries, while any checks deposited to it would mean credit entries, and the relation between the two kinds of entries would show the status of the account as a whole. Any persons starting a partnership, co-operative or other form of organization which was, as such, to act as a fiscal entity, would open a checking account in the organization's name, and then the subsequent procedure would be the same as with a personal account. The members of the organization being considered as guaranteeing its performance of its obligations. When such an organization was disbanded its account would be balanced and closed by those doing the disbanding. When a person died her or his account would be closed, the heir or heirs taking over the credit balance, if any, or making good the debit balance, if any.

Thus there would be two groupings in which *all* sane adults would participate (each have a vote), the territorially-based public administration of the highway-park systems; and the system of Equitist Mutual Credit Exchange Banks. The latter would not need to conform to the territorial divisions of the former, as such divisions would be solely for convenience in the administration of those portions of the earth which must be held in common for the maintenance of equal freedom in the use of natural resources.

All activities outside of those pertaining to those two groupings would be carried on by private individuals and private groups of individuals according to the inclinations and circumstances of such. Thus the supplying of water, electricity, etc., would be conducted by private persons or firms, as would the disposal of

*Where more than two candidates ran for any one office—in either public or private organizations—the voting would be according to the Concurrent Voting method. Each voter voting for just over half the candidates without indicating the order of preference; the candidate getting the largest total vote being the winner.

sewage, etc. And so would the transportation of goods and persons. All on the hour-for-hour of service basis.

That would result in a multiplicity of local and other organizations, those within each line of activity probably ordinarily being federated together for the mutual sharing of information and for other forms of co-operation. And those in different lines would be ever ready to share information or co-operate in other ways. Each individual adult would belong to as many or few such organizations as her or his interests and affairs seemed to require.

Through such organizations the various lines of production of material products could easily be carried on and co-ordinated by mutual agreement to any extent which seemed desirable to those involved. By each participant in such an organization sharing with all others any information along the organization's line, all would be enabled to remain up-to-date in their methods and know just what the situation was as to the probable supply and probable demand for their line of products.

All workers in a mine, or other productive plant would be members of the operating organization. And each such organization would be run by those members, they being the owners of the adult human services embodied in the equipment, etc. And such local producing organizations would have standing agreements with one another as to the quantities and qualities of products and the times and places at which they should be transferred, which one was to supply to another. Thus the different parts of a large or complicated machine might be made in different shops and assembled in still another, all according to agreed upon schedules. Such an arrangement would give the maximum of individual choice of action possible in combination with efficiency in production.

Industrial undertakings then tending to be decentralized and federated in their administrative structure, it would give wide flexibility, making readjustment to keep up with technological progress relatively easy. Also it would make it handy for the members of any local group to so adjust the time and manner of their production as to fit the other affairs of the individual members. And much producing, machine and handicraft as well as horticultural, could be satisfactorily done in the homes of the workers. All agreements to furnish products would be so arranged as to leave a margin of time above that actually required for the process—as folk would merely wish to produce enough to supply a moderate demand, not the maximum that a firm could meet if necessary.

Every sane adult of both sexes and regardless of whether single or married would serve other persons sufficiently to be financially self-supporting. So that marriage would be a true partnership of equally free persons who wished to live their lives largely jointly.

The merit incentive would take the place of the present profit incentive as the all-pervading urge diffused throughout human affairs, in the background of them where not in the foreground. Honesty in all one's dealings would then be a mere matter-of-course. And children would grow up in a mental-emotional atmosphere of self-reliance and mutual helpfulness. While financialy dependent upon their elders until grown (say, twenty-one years of age) the non-adults would prepare for becoming financially self-supporting as soon as they became adults—financial self-support then being one of the specific rights and responsibilities of a normal adult. The choice of occupations would be an individual matter according to the preferences of each individual. All sane adults throughout the world would be on the same footing as to all rights or responsibilities; free to go anywhere either as visitors or permanent residents utterly regardless of variations in ancestry or personal appearance, or sex.

Naturally, with the coming of the *equal freedom* attitude into dominance in human thought and feeling it would more and more dominate human affairs. So that all old or other beliefs in conflict with such equality of freedom between mentally fairly normal adults would die out. And so the customs arising from such beliefs would cease. Thus the ramifications of the idea of *each* sane adult being directly, individually, *self-governing* would reach into *all* the details of private as well as public living. That would result in a truly new social order.

The new banking arrangements being world-wide anyone could travel anywhere without fiscal inconvenience, as her or his checks on her or his local bank would be readily accepted by anyone in any part of the world. For convenience in having non-adults run errands or in letting such in their teens travel alone, the parents could have checkbooks in which each check bore the owner's name and had a space for the signature of the non-adult actually filling out the individual check.

The above indicates the sort of foundation on which equitists conceive that a truly, thoroughly, harmonious human association and consequent civilization can be built whenever the above indicated basic essentials of *equal freedom* have become understood and hence approved by the overwhelming majority of the adults and near-adults throughout the world. The essential is that *each* sane adult be directly, exclusively, self-ruled, and hence be free to devote the whole of her or his adult life to her or his *own* benefit. That means that *all* non-gift serving of another such person by such a person *must be* on the basis of an *equal duration* of service in return.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.

Correspondence

A Socialist Rejoinder

EDITOR OF UNITY:

Because I have been travelling constantly for five weeks, much of that time where mail could not reach me, I have only recently seen your amazing comment, under date of June 25th, on the Socialist convention at Detroit. I hope that even now I may be permitted to protest.

Advisedly I use the word "amazing," because, of all the intolerant, misinformed, and thoughtless editorials I have seen on the subject, this is the most intolerant, the most misinformed, the most thoughtless. I earnestly hope that by now, in later issues of UNITY, a more accurate report and interpretation have been printed.

With almost every sentence I am compelled to disagree. Speaking as objectively as possible, the least that can be said for your criticism is that it is reckless and so exaggerated as to lose all wholesome effect. It is simply not true that "these Socialist delegates could

only see among themselves those enemies within which they were most eager to destroy." Bitter controversy there was at a few points, impassioned moods there were; but on both sides was carried on a sincere struggle for ideas in which different groups had very profound faith. With the sole exception of two or three disappointed members of a majority which had now found itself a minority, there were no threats of secession. On the part of no single delegate were there efforts or desires for destruction. Evidence of the spirit which prevailed was the refusal of the victorious majority to push unfairly for radical committee representation from the West, which is in general conservative in the Party—a move which it possessed strength enough to make had it undemocratically so elected. Immediately upon the adoption of the Declaration of Principles, members of the majority voluntarily signed the minority petition for a referendum vote. Why not make mention of such things as these, instead of outdoing the sensationalism of the daily press?

Emphatically I deny that the convention committed the Socialist Party to the Communist tactics of dictatorship supported by force and violence. Using the worst methods of the propagandist press, you wrench a single sentence apart from its context, failing to print the stout declaration for democratic and orderly methods. Finally, you are so incensed at the Declaration of Principles for the sentences to which you give so fantastic an interpretation that you dismiss as useless the most drastic anti-war commitment ever made as yet by any American political organization!

I am sure, since the editor of UNITY is so well known to me and so trusted, that the editorial derives from the biased reports in the New York *Times,* against which formal protest was entered by the convention. Let me, then, state briefly what the Declaration does. First, it presents the program of Socialism applied in American terms to American problems. This is central. Second, it commits the Party collectively to organized war resistance, through the strike for peace if need be; and likewise against military training, parades, or expenditures; it calls for the development of agencies for peaceful settlement, but agencies that shall be non-imperialist, serving the peace aspirations of the masses. Finally, it prepares a strategy for social change in the face of a growing world-wide fascism. Under this head it asserts, unequivocally, its desire for democracy and order as the means and condition of coming to power. Envisaging what is likely to happen, however, so the Party and its several hundred thousand followers may not be found unprepared in a crisis, the program considers three things that may occur. Socialism may be achieved by an orderly transition through the ballot; that is what we want. Nevertheless, if we get a majority vote and are denied the right to carry out the popular will through a ruthless capitalist or Fascist faction using violence—as in Fascist lands—we shall undertake to crush that faction by maintaining labor solidarity in a general strike. UNITY, which of all papers ought to sympathize with such a strike as that which defeated the Kapp *putsch* in Berlin in 1920, and which finds inspiration in Gandhi's methods, ought not to call this "Communism" even if it does not entirely agree. Last of all, capitalism, very conceivably, may collapse in a complete chaos "which cannot permit of orderly procedure." In such a case the Declaration urges Socialists to establish and maintain a government under the workers' rule. UNITY finds this to be dictatorship and violence; I find it to be, in such an instance, the only hope of preventing the suicide of civilization. A small party, well disciplined, capably led, might be the only group competent to govern at all and bring peace and order out of anarchy and what Chancellor Bruening once prophesied as government by gangs. The Socialist Party would accept responsibility, govern by majority consent, and of course employ that coercive legal authority without which no government can be operated and without which democracy is impossible. The bolshevist method has been a dictatorship *over* the proletariat by a minority; the method of this Declaration is that of a crisis—authority used to organize and protect popular democratic rights.

This is the way toward non-violence and peace. Even the Tolstoyan pacifist, believing in no organized coercion, could exist at all in such a crisis only by the organization of an orderly, pacific, non-capitalist state. The alternatives are not pleasant for a pacifist to contemplate.

This is not written, of course, to contend that the Declaration is without flaws. Nor is it, either, to express any fundamental impatience with UNITY, which will always have, even when it disappoints me, my loyalty and enthusiasm.

DEVERE ALLEN

Asheville, N. C.

[NOTE: We are glad to print this important statement by one of the outstanding leaders of the Detroit Convention, author of the disputed Declaration. We do not desire to reply, but to explain certain points:

(1) That we did not exaggerate the tragic dissension in the Convention is shown by the furious controversy now raging in the Party. The Declaration has precipitated strife which it will take a generation to heal.

(2) We are little interested in an anti-war commitment in a Declaration which commits the Party to war in the class struggle. To be sure, it is war only in the last extremity, chaos, but war is never resorted to anywhere except in the last extremity. Why repudiate international war only to adopt class war. The general strike is not here in question.

(3) The crucial point in this whole discussion pertains to the pledged action of the Party in case capitalism collapses. We call the policy laid down "dictatorship and violence," and thus identical with Communism. It will be noted that Mr. Allen does not deny this, but simply asserts that "it is the only hope of preventing the suicide of civilization." It *is* dictatorship and violence, in other words, but justified. We cannot agree. Nor can we take seriously any "stout declaration for democratic and orderly methods" when such methods are openly abandoned at the only time when they really count—namely, at the moment of crisis.—EDITOR.]

The Field

(Continued from page 242)

selves, as most other nations have done, to use the Court, but psychologically this would have enormous importance and help tip the balance toward reason rather than settling disputes by explosives.

It would remove reproach. A London paper justly says: "Nothing has been more disappointing than the prolonged delay in the ratification of the World Court protocol by the United States. Three years ago it was signed by the President, and yet the Senate has not brought it forward and more than double that time has elapsed since the American reservations were ac-

cepted by the committee at Geneva. Delay of this kind is mere obstruction and unworthy of a great nation. Such a scandal would be impossible in our parliamentary system."

The patriot who cares for America's honor and usefulness must not be inert and silent in vacation time.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

"Don't Tell!"

Some Unpalatable Truths About War

Laurence Housman

A few years ago I went to speak to a branch of the Y. M. C. A., and there I told certain truths about war which could not be denied. The young men of my audience heard me willingly, sympathetically; an ex-soldier confirmed everything that I had said as true. The only people who thought that the truth ought not to be told to the young, as I had told it, were two old men who had not served in the Great War, having even then got past the age for military service.

Speaking, three months ago, at a meeting in Chester, I got a very different response to my unpalatable truths from an elderly member of the audience. He asked me to write them down, so that they might have a chance of reaching a larger public. And here they are.

I was dealing with the fact, known to all soldiers, but carefully concealed from the general public during a war, that atrocities are an inevitable product of war conditions, and are committed by both sides alike; and that sometimes they are committed, not by irresponsible individuals running amuck, but as "military necessities" under the orders of superior officers. Every instance that I gave I had got on first-hand authority; I had not gone round seeking them; they just happened to come my way.

I give first an "authorized" atrocity, carried out "under orders," by the teller of it. He was a Winchester boy, and had left school to join the army; he became captain in a Highland regiment. His duty was to go out with a party of nine men and "mop up" a captured trench—that is, to drive out its remaining occupants with smoke bombs; and as they came out from the trench, staggering helpless, half blinded, choked by the poisonous fumes, one of the party was stationed at the entrance to receive them; and one by one, as they came up, they were bayoneted. The excuse was that it was "inconvenient" to take prisoners.

A party of English soldiers was out foraging behind the firing line in a French village. They came to a small farm, wanting to buy butter and eggs. The farmer asked an exorbitant price, more than they were able to pay. Going away, they met some engineers and told them what had happened; they wished they could pay the farmer out. The engineers, willing to oblige, ran up a signal flag in close proximity to the farm; and in an hour the farm was shot down into ruin by the German guns.

An elderly German soldier had been captured by a group of "Tommies." It was "inconvenient" or impossible to keep him a prisoner. Because he was elderly, one leniently proposed that he should be allowed to run back to his own lines, and the others agreed. It was demonstrated to him by signs that he was free to quit. But as he turned to go, one of the party slipped into his pocket a hand-grenade, and loosed the time-fuse; and, as he ran, the grenade did its work, blowing him to bits.

An army chaplain (not then, but now, a confirmed pacifist) was serving at our base at Havre one night. In the small hours, he was rung up by the commanding officer. "Come down to the station," he was told, "there's been dirty work." He went out, and found that, in a train returning from the front a party of Highlanders, without an officer, had been given charge of some German prisoners. Mad with drink, in the seclusion of a large luggage van, they had spent the night, while traveling, in torturing their prisoners. Some were dead, some had gone out of their minds from terror.

When I asked that chaplain if I might tell his story, he asked me to say further that, though he was often under fire during the war, he was never nearer to death than when he stood between some French soldiers and some wounded Germans, whom they were supposed to have in charge for safe keeping.

I have given only a very few instances of the things done in war which those who believe in war claim that it is one's patriotic duty never to tell. The great conspiracy of "Don't Tell!" made necessary, and enforced by legal penalties, in time of war, remains with us, an organized hypocrisy of the military mind even in times of peace. That is the enemy we have to fight; for when the truth is fully known, militarism's game will be up.

The No More War Movement last fall captured from the said enemy "A Suppressed Speech," which is published and widely distributed at a penny a copy. It was given, during the war, as an official lecture to a certain O.T.C. by its sergeant-major. It was officially commended by the commanding officer, a lieutenant-colonel, D.S.O., who presided. It was issued officially for the instruction and encouragement of officers' training corps, consistently labeled "Not for publication." It advocated the killing of prisoners, the murder of the wounded, and the pretense to surrender by the holding up of arms, in order to take the enemy treacherously at a disadvantage; it denounced those things when done by the Germans, it praised them when done by ourselves. Its publication is a breach of copyright, probably also of the law that forbids the publication of official secrets—a law under which a distinguished author was recently fined £100. Nothing would help the No More War Movement better than for the government to prosecute it for its breach of the law. If it did so, I, for one, would gladly incur prosecution and imprisonment by continuing to sell the forbidden thing at the street corner; and I trust and believe that there are hundreds of others who would do the same. For one of the things that the peace movement has got to do, if it is to become real, is to teach dull minds that there is something higher than the law, and that, in the furtherance of a great moral cause, the law has sometimes to be broken.

—*Zion's Herald.*